

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**A. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Pending claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,097,455 (Babuka). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. With regard to Claim 17, Babuka does not teach or suggest fastening straps to back surfaces of adjacent display elements across seams. Instead, Babuka teaches a mask which is affixed to a polymer film layer, not to display elements. The Office Action contends that this polymer film layer is "merely the means for attaching" straps to display elements. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as Babuka discloses that the polymer film layer, while having an adhesive surface, also includes a separate polymer film material used to contribute to the optical response of the display. Babuka, 4:47-57.

Further, Babuka does not disclose that the masks may be used to redistribute a stress placed on a front surface of the display. Instead, Babuka discloses that the film layers are used to distribute stresses. Babuka, 4:58-64. Thus claims 17 and 18-20 depending therefrom are patentable over Babuka.

**B. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Pending claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Babuka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,862 (Sawai). Neither reference teaches or suggests straps attached to the back surface of display elements along seam lengths. As discussed above, the masks of Babuka are not attached to the back surface of display elements. Nor does Sawai teach or suggest such an arrangement.

More so, there is no motivation to combine Babuka with Sawai. In this regard, Sawai does not disclose an optical

integrator attached to a front surface of display elements. Instead, the optical integrator of Sawai is part of an optical path provided to a rear portion of a single display element, as Sawai is directed to a projecting image display device. E.g., Sawai, FIG. 1. Thus the combination of Sawai and Babuka does not teach or suggest an optical integrator attached to a front surface of tiled display elements and a plurality of straps attached to a back surface thereof to redistribute stress from the optical integrator to the straps. Accordingly claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 are patentable over the proposed combination.

Pending claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Babuka in view of Sawai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,592. For the same reasons discussed above, claim 4 is patentable over the proposed combination.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Rozman  
Registration No. 42,117  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024-1805  
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE